



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/302,552	04/30/1999	STEPHEN SAVITZKY	15358-46	7040

20350 7590 11/29/2005

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/302,552

Applicant(s)

SAVITZKY ET AL.

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 09/06/2005 to the original application filed 04/30/1999.
2. Claims 1-13 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Claims 1 and 9 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3 and 6-13 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **MacPhail** (U.S. 5,179,718 – issued 01/1993, as cited by Applicant's IDS filed 04/08/2004) in view of **Khan et al.** (U.S. 6,401,206 – filed 03/1998), as previously cited.

As to claim 1

- a. McPhail teaches in an electronic document handling system, a method of manipulating documents (*Abstract*) comprising the steps of:

- (i) generating a staple data object, for representing an association of selected pages of at least two selected documents (*e.g., establishing a staple relationship between two documents;; Abstract/ combining documents together in a staple relationship within a context of a folder; col.2, lines 58-60/ col.3, lines 45-53 and col.8, lines 7-10*);
- (ii) generating an electronic cover sheet for the staple data object (*e.g., The system then maintains the staple relationship between the identified documents within the context of the specified folder document; Abstract*);
- (iii) accepting from a user a list of at least one page of at least two electronic document (*e.g., An end user indicates to the system that a staple relationship is to be created between at least two identified documents stored in therein; col.2, lines 61-63/ col.3, lines 1-10 and col.4, lines 50-55*);
- (iv) referencing each page or each electronic document in the list as an item of the staple data object (*e.g., The staple relationship is then defined by entering an indication that the staple relationship is restricted to the context of the folder document ...pointers to the physical locations of the at least two documents in the system; col.2, lines 63- col3, line 2*);
- (v) accepting a staple instruction from a user (*e.g., the server files the identified documents into the library as specified by the staple relationship defined by the end user; col.3, lines 8-10 and lines 45-59*); and

- (vi) securing the combination of the pages of at least two electronic documents of the data object in response to receipt of the staple instruction, thereby creating an unalterable indicator of the existence the integrity of the association of selected pages and selected documents together at one time
(col.2, line 58- col.3, line 10).
- b. McPhail does not specifically teach the use of cryptography.
- c. Khan teaches the use of cryptography (*e.g., cryptographic; Abstract and col.11, lines 23-34*).
- d. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature from Khan in the system of McPhail because it would have provided the capability for establishing the integrity of the document, and ensures non-repudiation of origin to the extent that is was signed by the user's private key.

As to claim 2

MacPhail teaches accepting a manually input list (*col.4, lines 39-55*).

As to claim 3

McPhail teaches accepting a computer-generated list (*col.4, lines 39-55*)

As to claim 6

McPhail teaches copying the selected pages and selected documents in a stack to static storage (*col.3, lines 60-67*).

As to claim 7

MacPhail teaches copying the selected pages and selected documents in a stack to a local storage device local to the electronic document handling system (*col.3, line 60-col.4, line 12*).

As to claim 8

MacPhail teaches displaying a first list of documents, wherein the first list of documents lists the documents that are selected for inclusion in an open stack; displaying a second list of document, wherein the second list of documents list documents that have not been selected for inclusion in an open stack; and displaying a user interface control operative to obtain selections from a user of documents from the second list for inclusion in an open stack (*col.4, lines 13-38*).

As to claim 9

The rejection of independent claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, McPhail further teaches:

- (i) opening a secured stack upon receipt of a stack open instruction (*e.g., a EU can ask the system 10 to search for all documents regarding a particular subject and by a certain author which was filed in the library; col.4, lines 46-59*);
- (ii) presenting the contents of the secured stack for perusal by the user (*e.g., the system presents the EU with a list of the documents which meet the search criteria; col.4, lines 50-52*);
- (iii) accepting additions and deletions of items on the secured stack (*e.g., delete documents from the library; col.4, lines 57-58 and col.6, lines 15-19*); and

- (iv) securing the secure stack upon receipt of a stack restaple operation (*e.g., allow authorized end users other than the EU who filed the document to retrieve the document from the library and perform searches for and retrieve documents in the library for other end user; col.4, lines 60-67*).

As to claim 10

MacPhail teaches using a stack signature to secure the stack object, wherein the stack signature is a checksum of the contents of all the selected pages and selected documents in the stack, signed by the digital signature of a user or the digital signature or private key of a system (*col.4, lines 59-64*).

As to claim 11

MacPhail teaches storing the electronic cover sheet in a stack database, where it can be referenced (*col.8, lines 32-37*).

As to claim 12

MacPhail teaches generating controls for adding and deleting selected pages and selected documents from the stack (*e.g., An access control model object; col.5, lines 23-25 and Fig.2*).

As to claim 13

- a. MacPhail teaches the electronic cover sheet includes a visual indication that the existence of the association of selected pages and selected documents together at one time (*e.g., relationship is to be created between at least two identified documents; col.2, lines 1-67/ establish the staple relationship between a pair*

documents; col.3, lines 45-54). McPhail does not specifically teach the use of cryptography.

- b. Refer to discussion of claim 1 above for rejection of “cryptographically securing”.

- 5. Claims 4-5 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **MacPhail** in view of **Khan et al.** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **IBM** “Technical Disclosure Bulletin” (issued 07/1992).

As to claim 4

- a. The combination of MacPhail and Khan does not specifically teach “presenting a user with an online form as an aid to selecting pages or documents for association as a stack.”
- b. IBM teaches presenting a user with an online form as an aid to selecting pages or documents for association as a stack (*e.g., on-line documents ... the need for an on-line stapler; page 1*).
- c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine IBM’s teachings in the system of MacPhail as modified by Khan because it would have provided the capability for quickly and easily associating on-line, soft copy documents to another.

As to claim 5

- a. The combination of MacPhail and Khan does not specifically teach “*prompting for the staple instruction by presenting the user with a stapler icon which, when selected, represents the staple instruction.*”
- b. IBM teaches prompting for the staple instruction by presenting the user with a stapler icon which, when selected, represents the staple instruction (*e.g., a small stapler icon ... The user selects the stapler icons; page 1*).
- c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine IBM’s teachings in the system of MacPhail as modified by Khan because it would have provided the capability for quickly and easily associating on-line, soft copy documents to another.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant’s arguments filed 09/06/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that *Khan fails to disclose cryptographically securing an object, “creating an unalterable indicator of the existence and integrity of the association of selected pages and selected documents together at one time” as recited by claims 1 and 9.* (Remarks, page 7, last para.)

In response, the combination of MacPhail and Khan meets the limitations as claimed. Particularly, MacPhail teaches securing an object, “creating an unalterable indicator of the existence and integrity of the association of selected pages and selected documents

together at one time (col.2, line 58-col.3, line 10) and Khan is combined with MacPhail to teach the use of cryptography (Abstract and col.11, lines 23-34).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ferguson et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,820,094 issued: Nov. 16, 2004

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN

William S. Bashore

**WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

11/26/2005